UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/512,078	11/05/2004	Fabio Franceschi	023349-00298	3042
4372 ARENT FOX I	7590 02/23/200 LLP	EXAMINER		
	CTICUT AVENUE, N.	THAKUR, VIREN A		
SUITE 400 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20036	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com IPMatters@arentfox.com Patent_Mail@arentfox.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/512,078	FRANCESCHI, FABIO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
VIREN THAKUR			

	VIREN THAKUR	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acono event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	TE below);	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12			PTOL-324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allered. 	·		•
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Steve Weinstein/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1794	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant urges that claim 1 requires both a removable sheet of protective material which covers the top of the capsule and a pod comprised IN the first container. This argument has been carefully considered but is not deemed persuasive. Applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with claim 1 (or any of the other independent claims). Claim 1 requires that the first container comprises a pod but does not recite that that the pod is placed WITHIN the first container. By reciting that the first container comprises a pod, this has been construed to mean that the first container is the pod, which as disclosed by Favre has been defined by items 41 and 42. It is further noted that the independent claims appear to indicate that both the first container and the pod are defined by item 6 in the figures. This appears to indicate that the first container and the pod are one in the same, as opposed to a first container into which has been placed a pod.

Applicant further urges that "claim 1 requires a pod comprised in the first container also when the sheet of protective material is removed from the capsule." This argument has also been carefully considered but is not deemed persuasive. It is noted that applicant's urging is not commensurate in scope with the claims. None of the independent claims recite any limitations regarding the state of the first and second container AFTER the sheet of protective material has been removed.